

Amendments to the Drawings:

The drawing sheet attached in connection with the above-identified application containing the Figures is presented as a new formal drawing sheet to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheet. The drawing Figure has been amended.

The specific changes which have been made to the Figure are the lines and reference numerals were more clearly drawn. Additionally, reference numeral 35 was added as described in the specification as originally filed on page 5, lines 19-22.

REMARKS

Applicant acknowledges receipt of an Office Action dated October 31, 2007. In this response, Applicant has amended claims 1-4. Support for these amendments may be found in the specification as originally filed, *inter alia*, in the Figure and on page 5, lines 20-28. In addition, Applicant has added new claims 5-7. Support for new claims 5-7 may be found in the specification as originally filed, *inter alia*, on page 13, line 17 through page 14, line 2. Following entry of this amendment, claims 1-7 are pending in the application.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Objection to the Drawings

On page 2 of the Office Action, the PTO has objected to the drawings because the line quality is allegedly generally uneven and poor, particularly with regard to the reference numbers appearing in Figure 1. With this response, Applicant has amended the Figure to clearly show the reference numerals and with clear line quality. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objection to the drawings.

Objection to the Specification

On page 2 of the Office Action, the PTO has objected to the Abstract of the disclosure because it allegedly does not avoid using phrases which can be implied. With this response, Applicant has submitted a replacement Abstract to avoid such phrases. In view of these amendments, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objection to the Specification.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the PTO has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite and because they appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and contain grammatical and idiomatic errors. Applicant has amended claims 1-4 to avoid such errors.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection under § 112.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the PTO has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,586,652 to Sakurai (hereafter “Sakurai”). Applicant traverses this rejection for the reason set forth below.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). See generally MPEP § 2131.

Here, Sakurai fails to disclose an air conditioner housing with “a single mixing chamber for ventilation to both front and rear regions of a vehicle” as recited in independent claim 1. Rather, Sakurai discloses an air conditioner system comprising a main air mix chamber and a rear-seat air mix chamber, and wherein “[t]he main air mix chamber 14 and the rear-sear air mix chamber 22 are held in communication with each other.” Sakurai, Col. 3, lns. 67-68. This differs from the presently claimed invention which requires a single mixing chamber.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection under § 102.

Newly Added Claim(s)

In this response, Applicants have added claims 5-7 which depend from independent claim 1. Applicants believe that claims 5-7 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1 and also because of the additional features recited in each claim.

CONCLUSION


Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 3/26/08
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5540
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 
Paul D. Strain
Registration No. 47,369
Attorney for Applicant